

REMARKS

In this paper, claims 1 and 6 are currently amended and claim 5 has been canceled. After entry of the above amendment, claims 1-4 and 6-29 are pending, and claim 5 has been canceled.

An Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) accompanies this amendment. Another IDS was submitted and received in the PTO on April 6, 2004, but it was not acknowledged in the office action (another IDS submitted on 12/21/03 was acknowledged). If either or both of these IDS submissions are not in the PTO file when the examiner considers this amendment, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned so that a duplicate copy may be provided.

The applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 11-29.

The applicant appreciates the indicated allowability of claim 6 if rewritten in independent form. Claim 6 has rewritten to be in independent form, so it is believed that claim 6 is now allowable.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tatsuhiko (JP 4-368,290) in view of Turner (US 6,296,072). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the display control element selectively changes at least one of a hue or a color saturation of a backlight in accordance with signals from a light sensor. Tatsuhiko discloses a bicycle speedometer wherein an illuminating lamp is turned on or off in response to signals from a light sensor. However, neither Tatsuhiko nor Turner disclose or suggest selectively changing at least one of a hue or a color saturation of a backlight in accordance with signals from the light sensor.

Claims 2-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tatsuhiko in view of Turner and Weindorf, et al (US 6,563,479). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the display control element selectively changes at least one of a hue or a color saturation of a backlight in accordance with signals from a light sensor. Weindorf, et al teaches a display device wherein luminance may be

adjusted based on ambient brightness. However, none of the references disclose or suggest changing at least one of a hue or a color saturation of a backlight in accordance with signals from the light sensor.

Claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tatsuhiko in view of Turner and Weindorf, et al. This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed for the same reasons noted above.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 have been overcome by the foregoing amendment and remarks, and it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Deland
Reg. No. 31,242

DELAND LAW OFFICE
P.O. Box 69
Klamath River, California 96050
(530) 465-2430